UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,979	06/29/2001	Rajeeta Lalji Shah	AUS920010501US1	9262

7590   09/08/2004

Duck W. Yee
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER
TRUONG, CAMQUY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2127	

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 June 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-22 are presented for examination.

2.   The cross reference related to the application cited in the specification must be updated (i.e. update the relevant status, with PTO serial numbers or patent numbers where appropriate, on page 1, lines 1-25; the entire specification should be so revised).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

5.   Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. The following terms lack proper antecedent basis:

i. The task identification – claims 1, 2, 11, 12, and 21;

b. The claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:

ii. As to claims 10 (line 23), 20 and 22, it is not clearly understood whether a tasked refers to the unique task identification or the task identification (i.e. if they are the same, applicant is required to use the same term thru out all of the claim languages); line 23, it is not clearly understand what the relationship is between action and events (i.e. each action has a plurality of events or each event has a plurality of actions or they are the same).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-2, 4-12, and 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Lin et al. (U.S. Patent 5,949,415) in view of Daniel et al. (U.S.

Patent 5,321,837).

5.   As to claims 1, 11 and 21, Lin teaches the invention substantially as

claimed including: A method for tracking in logging system (col. 2, line 46), the

method comprising:

Receiving, at log task manager (program monitor, col. 4, lines 60-61), a

request from an application program to assign a unique task identification to a

related events identified by application program (col. 4, lines 20-22 and lines 64-

65; col. 5, lines 5-7);

Generating, at a log task manager, the unique task identification (col. 9,

lines 42-44);

Attaching the unique task identification to a transport mechanism (col. 6, lines 3 and line 19) that passes information between components (col.4, lines 60-62); and

Combining the task identification with logging information generated by one of the components (col. 5, lines 3-7 and lines 16-17).

6.   Lin does not teach filtering a plurality of logging information entries based on the task identification. Specifically, Lin does not teach the steps of filtering the received data and correlating them for presenting to a user. However, Daniel teaches the steps of filtering the received data and correlating them for presenting to a user (col.2, lines 12-18 and lines 24-27; col.4, lines 46-47 and lines 50-52; col.5, lines 10-15; col. 7, lines 6-10).

7.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Lin and Daniel because Daniel's correlating of received information would improve the tracking system of Lin by providing a more user friendly system with the timely identification of the root cause of problems / issues in the system.

8.   As to claims 2 and 12, Lin teaches attaching the task identification to a local thread transport (col. 6, line 3 and line 19).

9.   As to claims 5 and 15, Lin teaches the transport mechanism utilizes a port hardware (col. 3, lines 37-39).

10.   As to claims 4, 6 - 7, 14 and 16 - 17, Lin does not explicitly teach a remote proxy call, a point-to-point protocol and hypertext transfer protocol. However, it is well known to those skilled in the art, that is a remote proxy call, a point-to-point protocol and hypertext transfer protocol are needed for communication between components. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included a remote proxy call, a point-to-point protocol and hypertext transfer protocol because they would allow computers to be connected in network environment for exchanging information.

11.   As to claims 8 and 18, Lin teaches the transport mechanism utilizes a message context (col. 6, line 3 and line 19).

12.   As to claims 9 and 19, Lin teaches receiving, at the log task manager, a request from the application program for a second unique task identification assigned to second related serial events identified by the application (col. 4, lines 20-22 and lines 64-65; col. 5, lines 5-7); and

Attaching the second unique task identification to the transport mechanism (col. 6, lines 3 and line 19).

13.   As to claims 10, 20 and 22, Lin teaches mapping a tasked to a

corresponding action (col. 2, lines 44-46; col. 5, lines 15-17); and

Daniel teaches presenting logging information to a user based on the

corresponding action (col. 2, lines 15-19; col. 5, lines 9-15).

14.   Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Lin et al. (U.S. Patent 5,949,415) in view of Daniel et al. (U.S.

Patent 5,321,837) as applied to claims 1and 11 above, and n further in view of

Wong (U.S. 6,185,288 B1).

15.   As to claim 3 and 13, Lin teaches at the local thread transport, placing the

task identification on a local thread (col. 6, line 3 and line 19).

16.   Lin and Daniel do not teach at the local thread transport, extending the

inheritable thread local. However, Wong teaches extending the inheritable thread

local (col.9, lines 42-44).

17.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Lin, Daniel and Wong because

Wong's extending the inheritable thread local would provides a generic

mechanism to support multi-media multi-channel and multi-device

communication call setup.

Conclusion

18.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Camquy Truong whose telephone number is (703) 305 - 8888. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 703-305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR of Public PAIP. Status more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

Camquy Truong

August 31, 2004

MENG-AI T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100